

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES



BRIAN SCHWEITZER
GOVERNOR

JOAN MILES
DIRECTOR

STATE OF MONTANA

www.dphhs.mt.gov

PO Box 4210
HELENA, MT 59604-4210

TO: Dan Cleveland, Case Management Supervisor

FROM: Paula Miskuly-Tripp, Quality Improvement Specialist
Developmental Disabilities Program

RE: Quality Assurance Review

DATE: January 24, 2007

Please find attached the Quality Assurance Summary Report from the review of the Missoula DDP Case Management unit. As specified in the report, you will need to respond to the findings by February 12, 2007.

Since you and I have already met and reviewed the attached, I assume that it contains no surprises. Thank you for your cooperation with this process.

RECEIVED
JAN 25 2007
DPHHS-DSD

Region V State Case Management Review
Period Covered 9/05 – 11/06

Case Management Unit: Missoula DDP Case Managers

Dates of Review: 11/24/06 and 1/9/07

Case Managers Reviewed: Dan Cleveland, CM Supervisor; Bonnie Chambers, FT; Greg Ragee, 30 hrs/wk; Lori Lundberg, FT; Richard Fifield, FT; Kris Young, FT; Mike Dwyer, 20 hrs/wk; Jennifer Conners, FT; Gina Matosich, 30 hrs/wk.

Quality Improvement Specialist: Paula M. Tripp, DDP

CM Supervisor: Dan Cleveland, DDP

The DD Case Management unit in Missoula has not had a previous Quality Assurance review. One should have been completed during FY '06, but was not scheduled. As this is the first review, it is recommended that the Supervisor develop some strategies to address the findings and implement routine file reviews for the unit. No Quality Assurance Observation Sheets (QAOS) were completed, the CM Supervisor should respond to the findings by 2/12/07.

Case load sizes:

Dan	36 + 6 with MH case management, should have 23 – 2 files reviewed
Bonnie	31, could have up to 47 – 2 files reviewed
Greg	38, should have 36 – 2 files reviewed
Lori	46, could have up to 47 – 2 files reviewed
Richard	46, could have up to 47 – 2 files reviewed
Kris	45, could have up to 47 – 2 files reviewed
Mike	23, ok! – 2 files reviewed
Jenn	49, should have 47 – 1 file reviewed
Gina	33, could have up to 36 – 1 file reviewed

Based on the above data, the case loads and caseload sizes in the Missoula office should be reconsidered and redistributed. Current case load should not exceed 47 for full-time employees and a half-time case load for CM supervisors. Presently the CM supervisor is carrying too many active cases. The CM unit has split agency assignments out for the local intensive service provider to work with two case managers. There are pro's and con's to this, it may be time to reconsider intensity of CM service for individuals in intensive services vs. consumers with limited or no services.

Nine files of consumers in services were reviewed and seven files of consumers in CM only services were reviewed. Jenn and Gina do not have consumers who are not receiving services on their caseloads.

Standards for Consumers in services:

Contacts:

CM face-to-face contacts are required in the Montana State Plan. CM contacts and unit billing is dictated by these requirements: for individuals in services, 4 face-to-face contacts per year; and for individuals in Case Management Services only, 2 face-to-face contacts per year.

Nine files were reviewed for consumers in services, 1 per case manager. For all but two cases, the required 4 face-to-face contacts were completed (WR – Supported Employment only and KS – Intensive GH, I Day & Transportation). Of the remaining seven, three had six or more face-to-face contacts completed (JA – community supports 13 face-to-face contacts, TD – day only 6 face-to-face contacts, and CK – SL & day 7 face-to-face contacts).

Client Survey & Waiver 5 requirement:

Of the nine files, reviewed, seven had both the completed Client Survey and the Waiver 5 form on file. The same two file had both forms missing, this may be a training issue or, simply oversight by these two case managers (CK – SL and day and WJ – Intensive GH, Intensive Day and transportation).

Services Delivered per IP, Services Coordinated, and Protocols followed for Abuse & Neglect:

All nine files reviewed document that CM's were ensuring services were delivered according to the IP and that the CM was involved in ensuring coordination of services. None of the files reviewed had Abuse, Neglect or Exploitation concerns.

Standards for Consumers in CM Service only:

Completed signed ISP:

Five of seven files had current signed ISPs, though one was out of date by a few months. Of the two not completed, one consumer has since had one completed.

Referral up-to-date:

Only six of the seven files were for individuals on waiting lists. Of these six, two referrals are overdue for updates.

Coordination of resources:

For all seven consumers, resources available were found to be coordinated by the CM.

Contacts:

Six of seven consumers had the required two face-to-face contacts per year. One consumer has not has a face-to-face contact with his CM since May 2006. This consumer is also one of the individuals whose referral is out-of-date.

Summary:

The CM unit in Missoula is very active. There are many local services, and many needs of the consumers. Missoula has a large number of consumers in Community Supports services, this increases requirements for the CMs.

Two major concerns are noted from this review. They are distribution of case loads and trends noted in practice for consumers not in services.

Respectfully submitted:



Paula M. Tripp, MSEd/QMRP
Quality Improvement Specialist
Developmental Disabilities Program

Cc: Tim Plaska, Community Services Bureau Chief DDP
John Zeeck, Quality Assurance Specialist DDP
Perry Jones, Waiver Specialist DDP